HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE D.S.R.VARMA
AND
HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE P.LAKSHMANA REDDY

TAKEN UP WRIT PETITION NO.1165 OF 2007

Dated:13.02.2007

Between:

R.Bala Lakshmi

…Petitioner

And:

The Station House Officer, Shameeerpet
Rural Police Station, Shameerpet,
Ranga Reddy District and
four others.

…Respondents

HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE D.S.R.VARMA
AND
HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE P.LAKSHMANA REDDY

TAKEN UP WRIT PETITION NO.1165 of 2007

ORAL ORDER: **(per HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE D.S.R.VARMA)**

Heard the learned Assistant Government Pleader, representing the learned Advocate General, appearing for the respondents.

2. This writ petition is taken up on the basis of a petition, dated 26.12.2006, by one R.Bala Laxmi, Resident of Jaganguda Village, Shameerpet Mandal, Ranga Reddy District, to the Hon'ble the Chief Justice, High Court of Andhra Pradesh, stating, *inter alia,* that her husband by name R.Prabhu (Hamsala) was murdered by one Pinnoji Narasimhachary and his two sons namely Sriramulu

and Chandraiah, after kidnapping and grabbing her husband's ancestral properties. She seeks direction to Shameerpet Police to take action in the matter and consequently, to take suitable legal action against the concerned and pass appropriate orders.

3. In response to the notice, issued by this Court, the Inspector of Police, Shameerpet Police Station, Cyberabad Commissionerate, filed counter-affidavit stating, *inter alia,* that the husband of the petitioner was not at all murdered nor there was any alleged kidnap and it was found that he was very much alive; that basing on a complaint by one Keesari Chithari, a case in Crime No.21 of 2007 was registered for the offences punishable under Sections 447, 436 and 506 of the Indian Penal Code against the husband of the petitioner; that he was arrested on 09.02.2007 at Aliabad cross-roads and produced on the same day before the Vi Metropolitan Magistrate, Cyberabad, who remanded him to judicial custody.

4. In view of the revelations in the counter-affidavit, we find no truth in the allegations levelled by the petitioner in the said petition and, accordingly, no intervention by this Court is warranted in the present case.

5. For the foregoing, the writ petition is liable to be closed.

6. In the result, the writ petition is closed, at the stage of admission. However, there shall be no order as to costs.

_____

D.S.R.VARMA, J

_____

P.LAKSHMANA REDDY, J

13TH FEBRUARY 2007

DR/KRK